

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

<b>Subject</b>	Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee Meeting #7 Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Planning Framework	<b>Date</b>	August 18, 2021
<b>Facilitator</b>	Tom Crabbs	<b>Time</b>	1:00pm – 3:00pm
<b>Location</b>	723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, VA 23320 WebEx - <a href="https://governor.virginia.gov/i/sod3l">https://governor.virginia.gov/i/sod3l</a>	<b>Scribe</b>	Emily Sokol

<b>Invitees/Attendees</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization/Role</b>	<b>Attended?</b>
<b>Federal Installations Subcommittee Members and Staff Advisors</b>			
1.	Tom Crabbs	Chair - Captain, USCG (retired), Military Liaison, Office of the Secretary of Veterans & Defense Affairs;	Y
2.	Whitney Katchmark	Vice Chair - Principal Water Resources Engineer, Hampton Roads PDC	Y
3.	Jeff Flood - Staff	Coastal Planner, VA Coastal Zone Management Program	Y (V)
4.	Elaine Meil	Executive Director, Accomack-Northampton PDC	
5.	Kevin Du Bois	DoD Chesapeake Bay Program Coordinator	Y
6.	Tom Emerick	District Counsel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	Y
7.	Stephen Moret	President & CEO, The Virginia Economic Development Partnership	
8.	David K. Paylor	Director, VA Dept. of Environmental Quality	
9.	Craig Quigley	Rear Admiral (Retired), US Navy, CEO, Hampton Roads Military & Federal Facilities Alliance	Y
10.	Dr. Jessica Whitehead	Executive Director, Institute for Coastal Adaptation & Resilience	Y (V)
11.	Dillon Taylor	Chief of Staff & Senior Counsel, Virginia Department of Emergency Management	Y
12.	Samson Stevens	Capt., Sector Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Hampton Roads	
<b>Scheduled Speakers</b>			
<b>Subcommittee Advisors</b>			
13.	Laura Rogers	Project Manager, NASA Langley Research Center	
14.	Patrick Taylor	Climate Research Scientist, NASA Langley Research Center	
15.	Matt Lott	Emergency Manager, Virginia Department of Transportation	
16.	Doug Beaver	City of Norfolk	
17.	Bruce Sturk	City of Hampton	Y
18.	Scott Spencer	Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation	Y (V)
<b>Designated Alternates</b>			
19.	Sharon Baxter	Alternate for David K. Paylor, VA Dept. of Environmental Quality	Y (V)
20.	Rick Dwyer	Alternate for Craig Quigley, Hampton Roads Military and Federal Facilities Alliance	Y
21.	Jason El Koubi	Alternate for Dr. Stephen Moret, The Virginia Economic Development Partnership	
22.	Erin Sutton	Alternate for Dillon Taylor, VDEM	
23.	Matt Donaldson	Alternate for Tom Emerick, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District	
24.	Jessica Steelman	Alternate for Elaine Meil, Accomack-Northampton PDC	Y (V)
<b>Other Participants</b>			
25.	Ann Phillips	Rear Admiral, US Navy (Ret.) – Office of the Governor	Y
26.	Connor Winstead	VA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation	Y
27.	Matt Dalon	VA Dept. of Conservation & Recreation	Y
28.	Congressman Bobby Scott	U.S. Representative for Virginia's 3 <sup>rd</sup> Congressional District	Y

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

<b>Invitees/Attendees</b>			
#	Name	Organization/Role	Attended?
29.	Thomas Alston	Office of Congressman Bobby Scott	Y
30.	Emily Steinhilber	EDF	Y
31.	Keith Cannady	Deputy Executive Director, Hampton Roads PDC	Y
32.	Peggy Tadej	Northern Virginia Regional Commission	Y (V)
33.	Cyrena Eitler	Stantec	Y (V)
34.	Carol Holland	Dewberry	Y (V)
<b>Consultant Support</b>			
35.	Emily Sokol	Vision Planning and Consulting	Y

<b>Agenda/Minutes</b>		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
1.	Welcome/FOIA Preamble/Roll Call	<p>Jeff Flood welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced Subcommittee Members, those serving as designated alternates, and Subcommittee Advisors. Tom Crabbs reported that the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission facility suffered a power disruption this morning, so slides could not be presented in the room. Mr. Crabbs advised all in-person attendees to log into the meeting on WebEx so that they would be able to view the slides.</p> <p>Mr. Flood took roll and advised that a quorum was not present. He advised the Subcommittee that the meeting could continue but no motions could be voted on, as established by the General Assembly's recent guidance.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs then called the meeting to order at 1:07 pm and read the FOIA preamble and other required language. He asked public attendees to ask questions through the chat box and advised that Mr. Flood would be moderating the chat. If there are connectivity issues, please call 703-994-8781 for assistance.</p>
2.	Dewberry Outreach and Deliverables	<p>Mr. Crabbs reported that the Dewberry Federal Installation Partnerships Charette meeting, which was designed to engage partners on the efforts of the Coastal Resilience Master Plan, identify methods for greater collaboration moving forward, and receive feedback, took place earlier in the morning. About thirty individuals attended across the stakeholder constituency. The meeting consisted of a brief from Rear Admiral Ann Phillips, which she has been providing at various charettes across the Planning District Commissions over the past month, followed by a brief from Dr. Brian Batten regarding the results of Dewberry's Impact Assessment and Project Data Call. Dr. Batten also described the next steps for Dewberry in the coming months. Mr. Crabbs notified the Subcommittee that he also provided a brief at the meeting regarding the purpose statement of the Subcommittee, its current lines of effort, and an overview of its current "Crosswalk" Matrix, which is to be discussed in this meeting.</p>
3.	"Crosswalk" Matrix Version 2.0	<p>Mr. Crabbs provided a brief on the "Crosswalk" Matrix 2.0, which is guided by the mantra: "Locally Driven, Federally Funded, and State Supported." The Matrix outlines the DoD, USACE, and other agency federal funding opportunities that are available to the public, as well as the pathways that can be used to seek these funds (See Attached Slides). Mr. Crabbs identified that Mr. Flood and Whitney Katchmark began identifying funding sources for resiliency projects from other agencies, including Transportation and FEMA's Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) and Hazard Mitigation Grants Program (HMGP) programs. The Subcommittee is working to create a tool from a locality perspective that would work with state and federal entities to foster funding opportunities among the local, tribal, state, federal, private, and nongovernmental entities in the resiliency space. This space is extremely complicated to present in a distilled narrative, so creating a tool that</p>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>fosters transparency and provides localities with greater knowledge to seek funding for resiliency projects is a necessary task, but one that is very difficult to achieve. Mr. Crabbs reported that Mr. Flood has been building upon the work of Kevin Du Bois and Ms. Katchmark to help develop an effective and distilled product. Mr. Crabbs turned the floor over to Mr. Flood to describe his work on the “Federal Funding Opportunities ‘Crosswalk’ Application Steps.”</p> <p>Mr. Flood: Thank you to Mr. Du Bois and Ms. Katchmark for laying the groundwork for this product. I expanded the Crosswalk based on the conversations expressed during the July Subcommittee meeting. The goal of this product is to reflect what a local entity can do, knowing its needs and potential projects, to partner with federal installations and seek funding for resiliency studies and projects. We are trying to identify connections between the three tiers of funding options, DoD, USACE, and FEMA, as well as align the funding cycles vertically so that these funding sources can be stacked to benefit local projects. As you see in this sketch, we have shifted the three funding sources into lanes.</p> <p>Mr. Flood outlined each of the three tiers and the opportunities for funding associated with each, as well as the path to achieving these opportunities. He walked through the document as a stepwise narrative for guiding local applicants (See Attached Document).</p> <p>Discussion Point- Ms. Katchmark: I do not know if we have this right. We have not had time to check through this work and ensure we are working in the right direction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: Is it the sequencing or the descriptions? I am unsure of whether some of these steps are required precursors.</li> <li>- Ms. Katchmark: I do not know if this process can be limited to a step-by-step flow. It is so complex, and the steps are different depending on the needs of the locality.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: I agree. I do not know if there is a set path for success in this process. Do you need to do one step before all of the others? One thing we have found as a Subcommittee in conducting this work is that a locality that is sharing space with a DoD installation should have a JLUS on file and keep it current. OLDCC recommends that JLUS studies be updated at least every 5 years. There are some comprehensive JLUSs out there.</li> <li>- Ms. Katchmark: I guess the point I’d like to highlight is that I don’t know if you need a JLUS to get REPI funds like the USACE has a progression for CSR [Coastal Storm Risk Management] to do feasibility studies prior to funding projects. And localities have CIP’s [Capital Improvements Plans]. It is difficult to make a flow chart because there are too many forks throughout the process depending on the needs of the locality and the types of projects they are pursuing</li> <li>- Tom Emerick: When conducting civil works projects, for some of our missions, we have a standard authority in funding. For some other civil projects, we have to get authority by appropriations to carry out the mission. But for some of our projects we have a Continuing Authorities Program we have a standing authority and funding to carry out the mission. So, for something like the Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management we have to get authority to do the study then we have to get the authority to do the pre-construction engineering design, then the authority and appropriations to do construction. So, we have to continue to get Congress to authorized and appropriate funding for those.</li> <li>- Keith Cannady: Authority from civil works does not allow you to look at federal land.</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: If we could do it anywhere on short notice, Langley is probably the best option because they Hampton has such a strong relationship with Langley. The challenge for DoD is execution year, hardly any flexibility in spending and these things come up in execution year. There is state money still available for Public Safety and Homeland Defense - \$500k that is set aside for Hampton Roads Northern Neck, and Northern Virginia for CSRSM studies so that is the only Virginia money set aside as match. Just trying to match up the Federal funding process with the way these studies come to pass is the challenge.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: To summarize Ms. Katchmark’s point, there is no one golden pathway. There are multiple paths that can be taken in this process. As a locality, you need to know your situation and your needs so that you can evaluate what path may be the most successful for you to take.</li> <li>- Ms. Katchmark: It is a start, but we might need to move away from a simple stepwise format in order to accurately portray the process.</li> <li>- Mr. Du Bois: The localities need to be able to determine from their circumstances what path will be best, based on their capacity.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Flood: Ms. Katchmark and Mr. Du Bois completed the foundational steps for this document, which we will need to build out moving forward. I have a few questions highlighted in the document that need to be addressed, but I do not want to take up time, since the Subcommittee members have not had an opportunity to review the document. Mr. Du Bois also created a table that we could use by coming up with a hypothetical project and running it through the table to test the process and the opportunities that hypothetical application could pursue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bruce Sturk: This whole process is about linking different funding sources. If you are a locality that needs to build capacity, your perspective will be very different from that of a locality who is seeking to implement a project.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: That is a part of Dewberry’s work- researching funding sources and organizing them in a way that allows localities to identify what sources may apply to their projects. From there, they can narrow down the steps of applying and best approaches that can be taken to seek these funds, as well as determining funds that can be matched. It is a very complicated puzzle.</li> <li>- Mr. Sturk: We will be able to work through those complexities, though there will always be room for improvement. At least we can get started by outlining existing options, identifying opportunities, and trying to clearly identify paths that localities can take.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: There is an interest at the federal level regarding the alignment of these processes and their timelines across different agencies. However, it is also complicated at that level.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Rick Dwyer: From a visual perspective, I prefer the horizontal flow you have outlined, as opposed to the rainfall style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: This morning, we had time to meet with Dewberry and Dr. Batten. I told him that we are looking to provide a graphic that is intuitive from a local perspective and will answer questions like: what is available to me, can I navigate this space myself, and where can I seek assistance with capacity? The graphic could also be used by the state and federal entities so that they can understand how the localities are being guided. I asked him if his team could help produce this graphic based on what we have accomplished, since they have individuals who specialize in graphic</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>representation. He said that they could help us in this effort. So, thank you for that observation, we will relay that to their team as we move forward.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs: Based on our previous meetings and discussions, there seems to be a consensus from the Subcommittee that we want to provide a direct deliverable to Dewberry for incorporation into the Coastal Resilience Master Plan. I want to set this as an official expectation for our Subcommittee, so I mentioned to Dewberry that the deliverable might be a white paper to supplement this visual. We are not able to vote on it at this meeting, but if there are any objections, we can discuss it. By mentioning this intention to Dr. Batten, I feel that I have us on the hook for executing this task.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Flood I hope that this would be the foundation of said white paper. I know it is quite text-heavy, but we have an outline and can fill in the gaps moving forward.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: Are there any highlighted areas in the document that we need to discuss?</li> <li>- Mr. Flood: There are some specific questions, but if they are too much of a deep dive, considering that we did not provide the document to the Subcommittee ahead of time for their review, we can hold off.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Dwyer: Regarding the JLUS question (“Does a JLUS require an installation nomination by locality/State or self-nomination?”, my understanding is that the locality will nominate the installation but must have the support of the installation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: The endorsement of the installation is incredibly important here as well. If you do not have the installation’s endorsement, you cannot move forward. Same with DCIP.</li> <li>- Mr. Dwyer noted Jeff’s listed question about using REPI funds to conduct studies outside of the fence line – yes, there can be conservation easements extending outside the fence line.</li> <li>- Mr. Sturk: We use REPI funding outside of the fence line quite often, especially for site approach zones</li> <li>- Adm. Quigley: Applicants must draw a connection between the installation’s mission and the designation or easement.</li> <li>- Mr. Dwyer: There are many opportunities that arise as a result of establishing a Sentinel Landscape. It is important in the application process that you are able to communicate how the project aligns with the installation and its overall mission.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: I didn’t include Sentinel Landscapes in the slide today because it does not provide a steady flow of funding, though they do provide a funding coordinator for the first three years. Being established as a Sentinel Landscape does open doors and establish a commitment to implementation.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Mr. Du Bois: In looking at the figure, it seems to me that it demonstrates Compatibility Use studies and Military Installation Resilience (MIR) studies as synonymous, but that is not the case. So, the figure seems to be a bit misleading or confusing in that sense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: Yes, that needs to be demonstrated more clearly in the figure to show that those are two completely different options that localities might need to choose between, depending on their particular situation. I recently attended the Association for Defense Communities conference last month and heard a presentation by the OLDCC director Patrick O’Brian, who mentioned the MIS (Military Installation Sustainment) program, but not sure if opening it up to act like a JLUS. Their</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>intention is not likely to make the MIS act like a JLUS. MIR comes out of the MIS program, but MIR is the money you're going after. Would recommend tracking developments in this program.</p> <p>Discussion Point- Ms. Katchmark: There are implementation grants that can get you to the design phase. I do not know how deep to go for this document, because this is a different model than the initial Crosswalk. Is it supposed to outline planning, design, and implementation? We might separate these into easier steps for each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Du Bois: In the table, it needs to specify whether it is a planning or implementation pathway.</li> <li>- Ms. Katchmark: Yes, I feel we may have taken a different way here, that the purpose of this document is different than that of the initial Crosswalk.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: That was definitely not the intent of this work, and we did not mean to lose any information from the original document. We attempted to project a simple figure, but we've lost a lot of the detail that you had provided in your document. Also, we acknowledge that there isn't a one size fits all path. Each locality needs to identify the path that reflects the best resources for their effort.</li> <li>- Mr. Dwyer: You could reference a need as proposed by the JLUS as a starting point.</li> <li>- Ms. Katchmark: Step 1 could be to first identify your problems with the local installation then pursue funding appropriately. This was my best attempt to lay out the steps in a methodological way that would make sense to the reader, but I am unsure that a stepwise methodology is the right way to approach this.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: You outlined every stepping stone available for OLDCC and USACE, but how the localities choose to lay out these steps may be different when trying to address the coastal resiliency issue at the local level.</li> <li>- Ms. Katchmark: It is not for lack of resources. This document may be a rule of thumb for localities or individuals to identify how their project best aligns with particular funding sources. Once a locality knows its problem areas and what types of projects can be used to address those problems, it can then determine what funding option would best align. This stepwise flow is extremely complex and may not be entirely possible.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: Regardless, it can provide transparency and a level playing field to all. For those entities that lack the capacity and awareness to understand what we have been working on for months, this can be an exceptionally helpful tool. By providing this, it levels the playing field because they can begin to engage this field with confidence.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Flood opened the floor to Scott Spencer, who provided multiple edits to the document.</p> <p>Mr. Spencer: While the Compatible Use study is not necessary for any of these solutions at the tail end, it is a good way to identify problems of resiliency and encroaching around an installation. Sometimes those solutions are outside of our lane, so we might switch to REPI or USACE. REPI asks if a Compatibility Use study has been completed. These MIR and Compatibility Use studies are important first steps because they better identify the problems at hand and provide an opportunity to outline needs, especially since DoD offers funds to complete the study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Du Bois: Navy Station Earle moved from a JLUS to a regional resiliency study with a REPI proposal, and then followed that up with another REPI proposal to</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<p>establish a Sentinel Landscape. The folks that know how to connect the dots between these different funding sources are likely in the minority. Few installations actually understand how to navigate this area. We proposed having a regional JLUS REPI committee that would seek to identify how we might level the playing field by building awareness of how to connect these dots. There is some value in building awareness across the state regarding how to move from plan to implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: Although it may be unclear to us, those on the federal side who work for these agencies know how the monies are moved, or how these projects are sequenced.</li> <li>- Mr. Spencer: One expectation that we look at is if the installation is up to date on their internal plans- that is the beginning. When you go to the next step of moving forward with the community and application grant, the locality should then be identifying those different funding sources. If it is a resiliency project, they want to see a connection between the study and the mission of the installation.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion Point- Mr. Crabbs: What are the distinguishing characteristics of the Compatibility Use study and the MIR study?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Spencer: We changed JLUS to now be named the Compatible Use Program, which is focused on mission encroachment. The MIR program is assessing natural and utility resilience.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Flood then moved through multiple points of discussion highlighted in the document.</p> <p>Mr. Flood: Would the state provide funding assistance to an NGO applicant?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: It depends. The Community Flood Preparedness Fund does not allow that. REPI and Sentinel Landscapes require partners, but NGOs are widely represented in those programs. It really depends on the program.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Flood: Is a JLUS required for Sentinel Landscapes funding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: No funds from Sentinel Landscapes, just a designation</li> <li>- Mr. Du Bois: I don't think a JLUS is required for a Sentinel Landscapes designation, but it's a part of finding ways to leverage grant funds. The money doesn't go to a locality, but to private landowners. The partnered entities help focus those funds through the Sentinel Landscape to support those installations.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: It shows that you are doing your homework and gives you an edge in applying for funds from other sources.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: It requires the facilities to have a JLUS.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Flood: Can REPI funds be spent "outside the fence line" in support of a military installation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple people in the room: Yes</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Flood: Where does the Defense Access Roads Program fit into this outline?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rick Dwyer: This program is a tool for military services that allows the military to pay their share of locality road improvements when necessary to mitigate an impact on military activity. The fund for this program could technically be used for resiliency efforts.</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

Agenda/Minutes		
#	Agenda Item	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: Similar to a National Forest Road where no one else would build it.</li> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: I believe the money can be appropriated directly now. Money from this fund could have been used for resiliency plans earlier; however, those projects would be coming out of the same budget as other projects, so there was a lot of competition. This is a big change, not having to take funds out of budgets bases already have.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Flood: There are additional gaps that need to be filled moving forward; however, we can fill in these spaces later, as they will require a larger effort.</p> <p>Mr. Du Bois provided background information on the worksheet exercise that he created: I began to get bogged down in the program design versus program implementation processes when reviewing these steps. I want to be able to map out the roles of each partner during every stage of the process. If a locality or entity is new to any of these processes, how do they go about leveraging their efforts. To better understand the process as a whole, it helped me think about each entity's role in obtaining each of these funding sources. This would help everyone going forward in identifying a path to take and determining what everyone's role is in execution.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs returned to the Matrix 2.0 to provide a summary of the efforts moving forward: What are the next steps? We are committing to creating a transparent product for localities, state, and federal entities that allows alignment, awareness, and a level playing field for all entities to engage funding sources. Between our three current efforts, we are converging products to create a final deliverable for the Master Plan. We will continue to work on this product, folding each effort into it. Understanding all of these complexities, the next step is to continue to put thought and energy into developing this product for Dewberry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rear Admiral Phillips: The TAC meeting is on September 2<sup>nd</sup>, so all of the Subcommittees are to make their recommendations for what should be included in the Master Plan, as well as their recommendations regarding how the Subcommittees should continue, and in what form. Dewberry's 90% draft document is due September 8<sup>th</sup>, so the sooner you can get us this product, the better. Regarding what goes in the main document versus the appendix, there is some flexibility. However, you need to submit a recommendation of what should be put in the main document by the TAC meeting so that we can leave a space for it in the 90% draft.</li> <li>- Mr. Crabbs: My goal is to press out more products for you all to review and submit comments on as we move towards September 2<sup>nd</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Crabbs: The State is this lower block because it is acting in support of the localities. It acts by advocating with federal partners, matching funds, expanding capacity, and through governance. Is there anything else about the State's purpose that should be included? No response, so I assume you approve. The Other Agency block could also fill up ten extra slides, but the more we know about it, the better off we are.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dillon Taylor: I would just like to emphasize the need to include diversity, equity, and inclusion as a primary tennet in our State's role.</li> </ul>

**Virginia Coastal Resilience Master Plan**  
**Technical Advisory Committee – Federal Installation Partnerships Subcommittee**

<b>Agenda/Minutes</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Minutes</b>
4.	Public Comment Period & Next Meeting	<p>Mr. Flood yielded the floor to each of the public attendees, as well as Dr. Jessica Whitehead, a Subcommittee member who was not able to attend in-person and who did not have an opportunity to comment during the meeting.</p> <p>Cyrena Eitler: I do have a public comment, but not for this forum. I used to work closely with the REPI program to better coordinate Compatibility Use studies with the REPI program. I am happy to provide some comments, insights, and guidance about how local governments can better connect the dots, so I would appreciate you reaching out to me via email.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Flood: We will definitely reach out to you. Please put your email in the chat, and I will email you directly</li> </ul> <p>Dr. Jessica Whitehead: I am happy to help Ms. Katchmark and additional contributors fill in the gaps on some of the federal programs.</p> <p>Peggy Tadej: I am from NOVA RC and just received a grant from OLDCC, so I am just learning about this process.</p> <p>Rear Admiral Phillips thanked all of the attendees for their time, patience, and valuable work. She advised that this work will likely take a long time to be made functional, but it is necessary and well-appreciated.</p> <p>Congressman Scott thanked the Subcommittee members for their work. He acknowledged that, if the Bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act were to provide tens of billions of dollars for resiliency efforts, he hopes that spending the money will not be as difficult as the Subcommittee recognized in their discussion.</p> <p>Mr. Flood announced that, in keeping with the Subcommittee’s monthly schedule, the next Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for September 22, 2021, from 1:00pm to 3:00pm.</p>
5.	Wrap-Up and Adjourn	<p>Mr. Crabbs thanked Ms. Katchmark and the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission for hosting the meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Crabbs called for a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was proposed and seconded. Mr. Crabbs adjourned the meeting at 2:43 pm.</p>

<b>Action Items</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Owner (Organization)</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
1.	Continue developing deliverable for submission to Dewberry, and determine where in the Master Plan this deliverable should reside.	Subcommittee Members	September 2, 2021
2.			

If you have any questions, please contact Emily Sokol, Vision Planning and Consulting, at [esokol@vision-pc.net](mailto:esokol@vision-pc.net).